

first of which was the determination of the role Iran was to play in the maintenance of world peace and American security. If it was a matter of indifference to the United States whether or not Iran was going to fall victim to Soviet expansion and Communism, then it would not be illogical to leave her to her own devices. If, on the contrary, the United States was interested in the preservation of Iranian independence, then a positive policy should have been formulated. Such a positive policy would not have rejected any medium through which American influence could be exerted, whether advisers, direct diplomatic action, or a well-conceived propaganda.

With regard to the advisers, their continued presence in Iran could then be treated not as an isolated phenomenon, but as an integral part of the American task in Iran. In such a case their services to Iran could be conceived of as an excellent means by which to strengthen the friendship and bolster the courage of the Iranians against Soviet infiltration. Their presence could also be utilized as a warning to the Russians that the United States was not ready to see Iran share the fate of eastern Europe. If such a policy had been adopted, it might have been wise to defend more vigorously Mills-paugh's position, while persuading him to be less uncompromising in his "puristic" attitudes. His replacement by another man endowed with greater diplomatic skill might then not have been out of the question. As it was, the inglorious way in which he was dismissed from Iran constituted a blow to American prestige and created lack of confidence in the firmness of American foreign policy.

Thus undoubted harm was done to the otherwise correct official diplomacy conducted by the American government and its Embassy

in Teheran. The extension of lend lease to Iran, the aid proffered by the largely American-influenced Middle East Supply Center, the willingness to respect the Iranian refusal of oil concessions—all constituted irrefutable proofs of honest international conduct.

By far the greatest achievement of American diplomacy in its dealings with Iran was the Teheran Communique of 1943. This declaration probably did more to enhance Iranian faith in the United States than any other American official act in wartime. The authorship of the declaration was generally ascribed to the Americans, and this was correct. Moreover, it was understood in Teheran that the